Eastern Shore REPUBLICAN STAR OR General Advertiser.

EASTON—(MARYLAND) Printed and Published every *Tuesday Morning*, by THOMAS PERRIN SMITH, Printer of the LAWS of the UNITED STATES.

[VOL. 10.....13.] TUESDAY MORNING, OCTOBER 1, 1811. [No. 5.....619.]

TERMS OF THE STAR—Are *Two Dollars and Fifty Cents* per annum, payable half yearly, in advance: No paper can be discontinued until the same is paid for.

ADVERTISEMENTS—Are inserted three weeks for *One Dollar*, and continued weekly for *Twenty-five Cents* per square.

FROM THE ALBANY REGISTER.

COMMENTS

On the diplomatic absurdities and anti American doctrines of Timothy Pickering.

No. III.

Of all the weaknesses of man the ambition of legislating seems to be the most intoxicating and unfortunately the most common; hence those innumerable collections of contradictory, useless and arbitrary laws which encumber the archives of almost every country. Called by the favor of a court or a republic to the councils of a nation, every little ephemeral statesman considers himself as a Solon or Lycurgus, and crowds his thoughts, his dreams or his resentments into the code of the people doomed to submit to his errors. By such men, when Mr. Pickering was driving with a centrifugal rashness the wheels of the federal administration; when terror & extermination were become the sign and countersign of his measures; when his bosom friends, representatives of a people distinguished by its philanthropy, were industriously exciting every American citizen, every American woman, every American child, to murder every Frenchman, every French woman, and every French child in America; when the men of war of the United States were degraded into tenders to the British squadrons, and when unsuspecting Frenchmen with joy the approach of Americans as friends and brothers, received carnage and death as a reward for their credulity; the laws of the United States have been disgraced by statutes destructive of the liberty of the press and the freedom of thought; air and light have been taxed, naturalization protracted beyond the probable duration of human life, in a new country whose agronomical and manufacturing policy ought constantly to favour the encouragement of foreign emigration; and our national legislature have been artfully brought to pass municipal & of course repealable laws, unnecessarily bordering on a relinquishment of a maritime dominion secured and warranted by ancient and modern treaties. Unable now, to dictate such irrational laws, that gentleman to indulge his legislating propensity has embraced the law of nations for his hobby horse, and from the presidential chair of the Essex Junto, promulgates under his own authority the tyrannical principles of the British navy, and presents that code of oppression and iniquity, the occasion of so many wars and under which our commerce has received so many injuries, as a pattern of human wisdom. Such are his words as recorded in his XVIth Number.

"When a nation is engaged in war & sends out its armed vessels to cruize on the seas, the common highway of nations, then the right to chase, to hail, to require an answer, to *board*, to *search*, and eventually to attack, accrues to the vessels of the nations at war, because they have a right to capture those of their enemy, for without these rights a naval war would be useless or rather could not exist. The neutral armed vesssel on the contrary, seeing her nation at peace with all other nations, *possesses none of these rights, because they are not necessary to any of the objects of neutrality and peace.* On the contrary she bound to avoid every hostile act except in her own defence when unjustly attacked. When she meets a belligerent armed vessel, *it is her duty*, if it be *demanded*, to make known her neutral character to prevent the shedding of innocent blood and the evils of war *hazarded* by a refusal to answer. As neutral she has no evil or inconvenience to apprehend by making her neutrality known; she has no right to chase, to hail, and insist upon an answer to board and search because she has no right to make a capture."

The French, during their revolutionary war, had among them a Prussian by the name of Anacharsis Cloots, who entitled himself the orator of the human race; and Mr. Pickering, after this exhibition of his knowledge, is equally entitled to the distinction of a legislator of the seas. He does not humble his genius to study the old or the modern law of nations; he does not trouble himself with the elaborate researches of Grotius or Puffendorff; he has even forgotten the old friends of the department of state, Vattel, & Professor Martin; but disengaging himself from all these fetters, and considering the modern law of nations as a bubble blown up by the pride of Catharine IId, and puffed up by Napoleon 1st, he embraces with venerations the regulations and orders of the British navy on the high seas, as the law of nations, whenever they are favorable, not to this country, but to its ancient oppressors.

As an American deeply interested in the honor and dignity of the North American confederacy, even admitting our maritime dominion to be out of question in the case now under consideration, my mind revolts at a doctrine evidently designed to criminalise our navy. I have diligently examined all the diplomatic documents relative to neutral rights, previous to the revolutionary and convulsive movements which have changed the old political balance of Europe; I have consulted the memorable declaration which the irregularities and excesses committed against neutral trade during the war for the independence of America, dictated to Catharine IId, the 28th February, 1780; I have examined the several acts of accession to that declaration, passed by the Emperor of Germany, and the kingdoms of Denmark, Portugal, Naples, &c. and in the face of the United States, I must contradict Mr. Pickering upon the fact he so boldly advances, the very reverse of what he asserts being the truth. The most elevated situation of a power in the scale of morality and reason is without doubt the neutral system: it is the principle of justice and moderation personified in a body politic, and it does not deprive those who adopt it from the natural right of self-preservation, which includes the power of repelling or anticipating an intended attack or outrage, and of resorting for the purposes of peace and preservation of all the defensive or prudential measures which the belligerents use for those of ambition or avarice.—The right of hailing, chasing, and even searching in certain cases suspicious vessels, belongs to the neutral man of war as well as to the belligerent, and in support of that opinion, I find, that by all the declarations and acts of accession of the armed neutrality, those powers bind themselves to prevent with the greatest severity their vessels or the vessels of their neutral confederates from carrying any contraband articles, subjecting them for that purpose to the visits and searches of their men of war respectively; but at the same time they solemnly declare that if any of their merchantmen were taken or insulted by any of the men of war of the belligerents, immediate complaint should be made, and if justice was not obtained, the most efficacious measures should be adopted to *procure satisfaction by just reprisal.* They bind themselves that if by hatred to those principles, either of them was troubled, molested, or attacked, they should make a common cause to obtain full satisfaction for the insult offered to their flag and to their subjects; they agree, that in no case whatever a neutral man of war having merchant vessels under her convoy, shall suffer them to be searched or captured, the word of the commanding officer being sufficient to prove that they have no contraband on board.

By the same covenants they all agree, that the invariable principles of neutrality are that a neutral has a right to sail on the coasts of a belligerent from port to port, that the neutral flag covers the property of a belligerent except such articles as are declared contraband by articles 10 and 11 of the treaty of 1766 between Russia and England, and that *no port is understood* to be *blockaded* but when the blockading men of war are situated so close the said port, that there is an evident danger to enter it.

These principles, altogether, are declared by the same power to be the law of nations with respect to neutral rights.

Nothing more has been stipulated or provided under the form of a public act by those powers with respect to the conduct of their men of war on the high seas, but the extreme delicacy with which they forbid them to suffer a merchant vessel under their escort to be indignity they would have treated the *disgraceful English notions* of Mr. Pickering, and with what wrath the great and spirited Catharine would have heard that one of the captains of her navy, in a voyage or a cruize to protect her rights or her dominion, had meanly condescended to let a French or an English officer interrogate him like an *old granny to know whence he came and where he was going, and whether he was a neutral or a belligerent*, and in addition to all these impertinent questions to fire a shot at him as a mark of his superiority.

Military custom between men of war on the high seas has established as the only confession of a nationality, the display of colors, ensured by a gun fired at a respectful distance to leeward & without a shot; and if it has been agreed so between their sovereigns they salute, if not, as the French have fixed it prudently, they do not salute at all.

But how different is the case now in consideration! The Little Belt was cruizing on our coasts, for the purpose of disturbing and intercepting our commerce and violating our dominion, in defiance of our sovereignty, of our treaties with England herself, and of our neutral system. She rendered herself highly suspicious in concealing her colours during a chase which was rendered indispensable by that irregular conduct! She was liable to be considered as a pirate or a smuggler, and treated as such, and finally, her firing with a shot at the President, instead of answering the proper neutral question of the commodore who commanded that frigate, if not viewed as a wilful hostile act, must be admitted to be one of those insufferable exalted ideas of British supremacy on the sea, which a few years more will render as ridiculous as the pretension of the grand Turk, the sophy of Persia, and other bigoted and infatuated Asiatics, to be the masters of the word, and to treat the christians as the neutrals are now treated by England.

If the God of reason and peace has not forever deserted the British shores, we ought to obtain the most satisfactory reparation. But how can we expect it, when our own country breeds men capable, *in such a crisis*, to add domestic outrage to foreign insult, to call the avengers of our rights murderers, and to metamorphose the first *spontaneous* act of a dignified neutrality, on the part of the U. States, into a projected war?

It does not belong to my subject to investigate the ideas of Mr. Pickering, on that projected war, since the limits which I have prescribed to my comments are those of diplomatic enquiries on the law of nations, relative to the case of the Little Belt, and to neutral rights. But as a constitution of my researches, I will in my next communication, examine by what means a pacific and neutral nation may prevent usurpation, invasion and insult, and strengthened by a long and successful experience, it will appear, as I have observed many years ago, that no neutrality has ever been respected, but when it was armed powerfully, by sea and land: Because among men, as among the rest of animalised creation, nothing commands respect but fear:—whoever has seen a dog defend a bone ought to have found it out; and whoever has heard the old adage, if you want peace prepare for war, ought to have known it. But unfortunately too often in republics the vain energy of language is substituted to the efficacious vigor of action.

EDMOND CHARLES GENET,
A citizen of New York.
Prospect Hill, Sept. 4, 1811.

☞ "AFTER THE ELECTION!"

After the election! After the election!

What mean these exclamations?—Why, I suppose after the election, one party will be in better humor than the other—is not this the meaning? No. Well,—after the election, comes the meeting of the elected, i. e. of the legislature—is not this the meaning? No. Let me consider; "after the election,"—bets are to be paid;—or, winter will come on? None of these is meant; and you might guess till dooms-day, if I did not tell you:—

Some time ago, the notorious Federal Republican of Baltimore, published an infamous untruth, reflecting on the character of Dr. Mitchell, of Cecil.—The editors were written to, but gave no satisfaction. And, yesterday, as we are informed, Dr. M. being in Baltimore, called on Mr. *Wagner*; reminded him of the gross calumny, to which he had given currency, and did not doubt his readiness *now* to publish a refutation. Mr. *Wagner*, with great *gravity* and *softness*, said these were documents which might have an electioneering effect,—and it could not be expected he would publish them *till after the election.*

Every honest man, of every party, must detest such shuffling. It is the duty of a man to be *just* at *all* times; of a printer, to correct mistatements the moment he discovers them. Indeed there is nothing more grateful to a generous mind than to repair a wrong, when convinced of it. In a word, the press is the most detestable as well as despicable engine, when it ceases to correct its own errors. But, look at the cold, phlegmatic, deliberate conduct of the editors of the Federal Republican. Having promulgated falsehoods for electioneering purposes, they are required to retract or refute the slander.—No, say they, we can't do so at present; there is another election pending, and we must not weaken the force of our past lies by contradicting them. Let them circulate and produce false impressions *till after the election*; and then, perhaps, we may insert your certificates and your letters. This is the plain English of their intentions and language.

Let the people of Maryland forever remember the policy of the federal leaders; that they openly (as it were) admit how they rely on *falsehood* to aid them, and refuse to publish the truth lest it should undermind their system.

When you peruse the following, recollect also, the *forged* treaties, &c. &c. &c. of the tory faction.—*Whig.*

Elkton, Sept. 7th, 1811.

Gentlemen,—

The following quotation is an extract from your paper of the 31st ult.

"A letter from a very respectable gentleman, dated 27th inst. states, that the writer was informed the piece which appeared some weeks ago in a democratic handbill with Mr. Miller's name to it turns out to be the production of Mr. George Mitchell of Elkton, & that Mr. Miller declares he never authorised Mr. Mitchell or any other person to use his name in such a way." As it is your duty, and the professed object of your paper, to correct error and promulgate truth, I hope you will inform me of the name of this "very respectable gentleman," and assist me in exposing so base a calumny, and in publishing the author an infamous liar. I request you to publish this letter and the inclosed certificate of the Rev. William Miller. In making this request, I ask nothing but what all those who wish to do to others as they would wish others to do to them will consider proper and right. Give the certificate three or four insertions, for which my friend Dr. Richard W. Hall will pay you.

I am, gentlemen,
Your fellow citizen,
G. E. MITCHELL.

To the editors of the Federal Republican.

In the Federal Republican of the 31st ultimo, I observe that Dr. George E. Mitchell is accused of having written and published without my knowledge or authority, the publication over my signature which appeared some weeks since in a democratic handbill. To those who know the honest, candid and honorable principles which have ever characterized that gentleman, a refutation of the base calumny would be unnecessary; but, as this charge is made in a public print much circulated in this State and the United States, I think it my duty, from respect to truth, to Dr. Mitchell, to myself and the public, to declare and hereby certify, that the above charge is *a base and malicious falshood.* The publication which bears my signature was written by myself, in form of a letter to a friend, and intended to inform my friends my reasons for changing my political sentiments; and they are the effect of mental conviction, and in giving them publicity I have only exercised the prerogative of an honest heart in complying with the dictates of my conscience. September 6th, 1811.

WM. MILLER.

Witness,
Stephen Hollingsworth,
Daniel Sheridine.

Federal Secrets worth kowing.

FROM THE SUN.

The following is a Federal Circular which was occultly distributed throughout Talbot county preceding the election. Whether the plan was matured in Baltimore and systematized throughout the state we have yet to learn. But it was obviously intended to catch the republicans napping, by the manner adopted to bring federalis to the polls, particularly in a county wherein federalists could have no chance of succeeding except from the lethargic conduct of the republicans. When we view the immense expenditures of the federal party, their assiduous, deceptive and diabolical proceedings and exertions to secure an ascendancy in the state of which they only form about a third we cannot too highly prize the fruits of our honest endeavors.

The annexed is addressed to Mr. Benjamin Roberts, near Skipton, which is in Talbot county. Should any one doubt the authencity of the circular, we have it in our power to satisfy doubts on the subject. A part is in print & a part in manuscript. The former in Roman, and the latter in Italic characters.

PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL.

To Messrs. *Benjamin Roberts, William Corkrell, William Hindman, John Seth, Edmond Weyman, Wright Callahan, James Beattie, Israel Rotholl, Uriah Chapman, John Allen.*

GENTLEMEN,

At a meeting of the Federal Republicans held at Easton on Monday the 19th inst. for the purpose of concerting the most effectual plan for securing the election of Dr. Tristram Thomas and Mr. Walter L. Fountain, as electors of the senate, it was deemed by the meeting expedient to appoint a committee in each of the districts in the county to ride from house to house, converse with all the voters in the district and make them sensible of the vast importance of the ensuing election, and of the necessity of vigorously opposing that system of politics, which brought our country to its present state of poverty, disgrace and danger, and to use every possible exertion to collect and bring up to the polls at an early hour on the day of election, all the friends of the above candidates.

The meeting reposing the highest confidence in your patriotism, zeal and attachment to those principles which characterized the administration of Washington, and have been invariably adhered to by the Federal Republicans, nominated you as committee to act in diatrict, No. 3. *Viz. from the Chapel and the road leading therefrom to Tuckahoe Bridge and then across to Wye, including Thimbletown, Bryantown, Skipton, &c. &c.*

We the subscribers were authorised to make the above communication, and we trust you will accept of the appointment, & execute the trust with promptitude and pleasure.

We are gentlemen, your most obedient servants,
P. SHERWOOD,
JOHN STEVENS, jun.
JOHN GOLDSBOROUGH,
R. GOLDSBOROUGH.

August 20, 1811.

Story of a Remarkable Beggar.

A Beggar to all appearance maimed and miserable, though in reality a hale fellow, but rather inclined to laziness, took his stand in Aldersgate street, London, where he asked charity from all passengers for many years.—There was something so winning in the fellow's address, that he was rarely unsuccessful in procuring something from the passers by.—Among others, one gentleman, a humane merchant, who passed every day through that street, constantly and without failure every morning, after hearing the charity-whine, gave some small matter—At last the merchant disappeared, and was not seen in the street for several months. After a while the beggar happened to fall in with his old benefactor, dressed rather shabbily—He immediately inquired the cause of his not having walked his wonted routs for so long a time—Ah, Mr. Lazarus, (said the merchant) I met with some losses at sea—my vessels were taken—my credit was gone, and I no longer would come your way—"Sir, (said the Beggar) how much money would set you afloat again?—"Why Lazarus, I believe about one thousand pounds might put me forward again in a small way—The beggar instantly stepped into an adjacent house, and brought out a parcel of Bank Notes to that amount—There, sir, (said he) take the reward of your former charity towards me—if you can ever repay me, it is well—if not, you must not trouble your head about the matter—your trade may turn out unsuccessful, but I can always beg.